

Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/000,347	KUDO ET AL.
	Examiner Gautam R. Patel	Art Unit 2655

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Gautam R. Patel. (3) _____.

(2) Mr. Ronald P. Kananen. (4) _____.

Date of Interview: 15 December 2003.

Type: a) Telephonic b) Video Conference
c) Personal [copy given to: 1) applicant 2) applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes e) No.
If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: 3.

Identification of prior art discussed: None.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g) was not reached. h) N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Some of inconsistencies and confusion in claim 3 with respect to various devices claimed was pointed out by the Examiner. After some discussion it was mutually agreed upon that these problems cannot be resolved easily at this point and prosecution should go forward and 112 first and second should be given..

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Examiner's signature, if required